REMARKS

Claims 10, 44, 47, 48 and 50-57 are amended, as discussed below. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-17 and 19-57 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 112, Second Paragraph Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 10, 44, 47 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as indefinite. Responsive to this rejection, Applicants have amended each of claims 10, 44, 47 and 50 to eliminate the "is operable to" language.

Section 101 Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 48 and 50-57 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Responsive to this rejection, Applicants have amended each of claims 48 and 50-57 to recite a non-transitory medium.

Section 102(e) Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 4, 6-8, 10-17, 19-35, 37-46 and 50-57 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Graham et al. (U.S. Patent 6,594,700) (hereinafter "Graham"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

With respect to Claim 1, Applicants have claimed "a method for presenting results data in a distributed computing environment." The cited sections of Graham, by contrast, teach a system for handling service advertisements and lookup requests seeking a service. The first line of Graham's abstract states that a "service protocol adapter servlet listens for service advertising requests," and the abstract further continues with

various limitations for handling service identification in association with client requests, but presents no information related to presentation of results of a service. See Graham, Abstract. This difference in purpose between presenting results data, as claimed, and handling service advertising and identification requests leads to specific features of claim 1 that are not disclosed, either explicitly or by way of inherency, by Graham. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Graham does not anticipate claim 1, as discussed below, and Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

1. **Graham does not teach the recited limitation that "the data presentation process and the service execute <u>on separate devices</u> in the distributed computing environment," as recited by claim 1.**

That Graham does not teach or suggest all the recited features of claim 1 is most quickly demonstrated with respect to the limitation of claim 1 stating, "the data presentation process and the service execute <u>on separate devices</u> in the distributed computing environment." With respect to "the data presentation process accessing the presentation schema in the distributed computing environment, wherein the presentation schema includes information for presenting results data for clients in the distributed computing environment, wherein the data presentation process and the service execute on separate devices in the distributed computing environment" limitation, the Office Action cites col. 2, lines 28-49 and quotes col. 2, lines 38-50. The cited text lines of Graham state that

> "The USBIM is a coordinated set of components that collaborate to provide interoperability among service discovery protocols. Initially, service provider protocol adapter servlets listen for service advertising requests. Each protocol is associated with a different servlet that understands the details of the service advertising mechanism peculiar to that protocol. The service provider protocol adapter servlets then convert the service provider's protocol into a canonical representation of service advertising. The advertisement is stored in an internal registry. Client protocol adapter servlets listen for client lookup requests and look up a matching service provider. As with service provider protocol adapter

servlets, a different client protocol adapter servlet handles the details of client lookup for each particular protocol. The client protocol adapter servlets then convert the client request into a canonical representation of the request, which is used to look up the services required by the client and to match these requirements against the service provider advertisements stored in the same canonical form in the internal registry. Once a match has been found, the client protocol adapter servlet brokers the mechanism of client-service provider interaction."

Graham, col. 2, lines 28-49. The cited text does not address the existence of a data presentation process, much less specify that "the data presentation process and the service execute <u>on separate devices</u> in the distributed computing environment." The Office Action also cites to FIG. 1 and FIG.7. FIG. 7 is a flowchart that does not address the location of any component, and FIG. 1, while showing a network with various attached machines, provides no insight with respect to where various processes execute. Without actually teaching that that "the data presentation process and the service execute <u>on separate devices</u> in the distributed computing environment," Graham cannot disclose all limitations of Applicants' claim 1 and therefore does not anticipate claim 1.

2. **Graham does not teach the recited "the data presentation process accessing the results data," as recited by claim 1.**

Because Graham is focused on advertisements and service location, rather than the recited method for <u>presenting results data</u> in a distributed computing environment, Graham lacks the recited data presentation process of claim 1. Claim 1 recites, among other features, a data presentation process accessing a presentation schema, accessing results data, and presenting the results data to the client in accordance with the presentation schema.

With respect to the recited "the data presentation process accessing the results data," the Office Action cites col. 2, lines 28-49 and quotes col. 2, lines 42-48. The quoted text states that "[t]he client protocol adapter servlets then convert the client request into a canonical representation of the request, which is used to look up the services required by the client and to match these requirements against the service

provider advertisements stored in the same canonical form in the internal registry." The discussed use of canonical representations in the quoted text is logically incapable of teaching the recited "accessing results data" for the simple reason that the claim clearly states that a service generates results data in response to the request and the quoted text clearly states that the canonical representation of the request is used to look up services. Thus, the canonical representation of the request may not be interpreted as teaching the recited results data, which does not yet exist. No data presentation process is taught in the cited text of Graham, and certainly none is shown that is capable of accessing results data that does not yet exist, because a service has not been identified to generate that results data.

Simply stated, the claims recite a presentation schema accessing results data, and presenting the results data to the client in accordance with the presentation schema, while the cited text exclusively teaches operations that occur before results data is created. Thus, the cited text may not be argued to teach the recited "the data presentation process accessing the results data."

3. **Graham does not teach the recited "the data presentation process presenting the results data for the client in accordance with the information from the presentation schema," as recited by claim 1.**

Claim 1 further recites "the data presentation process presenting the results data for the client in accordance with the information from the presentation schema." With respect to the recited "the data presentation process presenting the results data for the client" the Office Action cites col. 2, lines 28-49 and quotes col. 2, lines 48-50. The quoted text states that "Once a match has been found, the client protocol adapter servlet brokers the mechanism of client-service provider interaction." While the Office Action does not make explicit the purported relationship between the contents of Graham and recited features of Applicants'' claim, Applicants conclude from this text that the Office Action intends to allege that the "brokering" teaches "presenting the results" and to allege that the client protocol adapter teaches the recited "data presentation process."

Applicants respectfully submit that nothing inherent in brokering a "client-service provider interaction inherently teaches "the data presentation process presenting the results data for the client in accordance with the information from the presentation schema." The Office Action also cites to FIG. 7, which is similarly silent with respect to the notion of whether a data presentation process exists and whether it is in any way used to present results data. The cited text is entirely silent on how data is presented to a client and therefore does not teach or suggest the recited "the data presentation process presenting the results data for the client in accordance with the information from the presentation schema."

4.   **For the reasons discussed above, Graham does not anticipate independent claims 24, 46 and 48.**

The arguments advanced above with respect to independent claim 1 apply equally to the rejections of independent claims 24, 46 and 48, which the Office Action has stated are rejected under identical reasoning. See Office Action, pp. 20, 25. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that each of claims 24, 46 and 48 is likewise allowable for the reasons discussed above. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Graham does not anticipate claims 24, 46 and 48, for the reasons discussed above and therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 24, 46 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

5.   **Graham does not anticipate independent claim 42, because Graham does not teach the recited "a service device configured to: provide a presentation schema advertisement... wherein the presentation schema advertisement includes information for enabling access to a presentation schema for presenting the results data," as recited by independent claim 42.**

Applicants have discussed above with respect to independent claims 1, 24, 46 and 48 that Graham fails to teach Applicants' recited limitations with respect to data

presentation. As noted above, the first line of Graham's abstract states that a "service protocol adapter servlet listens for service advertising requests," and the abstract further continues with various limitations for handling service identification. See Graham, Abstract. This difference in purpose between presenting results data, as claimed, and handling service advertising and identification requests leads to specific features of claim 42 that are not disclosed, either explicitly or by way of inherency, by Graham. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Graham does not anticipate claim 42, as discussed below, and Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

Claim 42 recites "a service device configured to: provide a presentation schema advertisement... wherein the presentation schema advertisement includes information for enabling access to a presentation schema for presenting the results data." The Office Action identifies the recited presentation schema advertisement as allegedly being taught at col. 6, lines 12-65. That the cited text is concerned with client lookup operations and service advertising rather than the recited results presentation schema is made clear from lines 18-25, which states that

> "In accordance with the present invention, internal registry 402 is an internal registry providing rapid in-memory access to a database of service registrations. The preferred embodiment of these service registrations utilizes Extensible Markup Language (XML) documents. The registry provides a convenient and efficient pattern matching mechanism for client lookup. In a preferred embodiment, internal registry 402 is implemented as an in-memory database providing the required characteristics."

Graham, col. 6, lines 18-25. The remaining text through line 65 discusses the mechanics of service advertising and client lookup in Graham, but none of the cited text teaches "information for enabling access to a presentation schema for presenting the results data," as recited. In fact, the Office Action quotes lines 50-65, which state that

> "the canonical representation is an XML-based representation of service advertising and lookup based upon an XML document type definition (DTD). The definition of a document type in XML consists of a set of

mark-up tags and their interpretations. The canonical representation is an important aspect of the present invention for providing interoperability among protocols. The role of the service advertising servlet is to convert the incoming protocol-specific data into the canonical form for service advertising in the registry. It is also responsible for protocol-specific details, such as service advertisement lifetimes or durations, service access restrictions, etc., for example Jini leasing. Similarly, the client lookup servlets are responsible for converting incoming protocol-specific queries into canonical queries in the registry."

Graham, col. 6, lines 50-65. As the text states, the role of the service advertising servlet is to convert the incoming protocol-specific data into the canonical form for service advertising, rather than the recited *result* data presentation. The quoted text is entirely silent with regard to the recited "accessing results data" for the simple reason that the is concerned with advertising and lookup, rather than the recited data presentation. The quoted text clearly states that the canonical representation of the request is used to look up services.

6.   The dependent claims are patentable.

The Office Action rejected dependent claims 3, 5, 36 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Graham in view of Zintel et al. (U.S. Patent 7,130,895) (hereinafter "Zintel"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In regard to the rejections under both sections 102(e) & 103(a), Applicants also assert that the rejection of numerous ones of the dependent claims is further unsupported by the teachings of the cited art. Further, each of dependent claims 3-8, 10-17, 19-23, 25-41, 43-45, 47, and 50-57 depends from and further patentably distinguishes one of allowable independent claims 1, 24, 42, 46 and 48, and is allowable for at least this reason. Since the rejection of the independent claims has been shown to be improper, a further discussion of the rejection of others of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5181-57700/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/
Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255
Attorney for Applicants

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: ___March 9, 2011___